

**JUL 31 2006**

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**

**CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS**

**FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

ANGEL MUNOZ MORALES; et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney  
General,

Respondent.

No. 05-75456

Agency Nos. A75-509-942  
A75-509-943

MEMORANDUM\*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the  
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted July 24, 2006\*\*

Before: ALARCÓN, HAWKINS, and THOMAS, Circuit Judges.

Angel Munoz Morales and Alejandra Munoz, husband and wife and natives  
and citizens of Mexico, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals'  
("BIA") order dismissing their appeal from an immigration judge's decision

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be  
cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule  
36-3.

\*\* The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without  
oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

denying their application for cancellation of removal. We dismiss the petition for review.

We lack jurisdiction to review the agency's discretionary determination that petitioners failed to show exceptional and extremely unusual hardship. *See Martinez-Rosas v. Gonzales*, 424 F.3d 926, 929 (9th Cir. 2005).

Petitioners' contention that the agency violated their due process rights by disregarding their daughters' medical records is not supported by the record and does not amount to a colorable constitutional claim. *See id.* at 930 (“[t]raditional abuse of discretion challenges recast as alleged due process violations do not constitute colorable constitutional claims that would invoke our jurisdiction”).

Petitioners' contention that their removal would violate due process by infringing on their right to family unity is unavailing. *See Urbano de Malaluan v. INS*, 577 F.2d 589, 594 (9th Cir. 1978); *see also Mamanee v. INS*, 556 F.2d 1103, 1106 (9th Cir. 1977).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED.**